



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,030	12/21/2006	Jorgen Ekelof	10400C-000202/US	5555
30/593 7590 09/25/2009 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				
EXAMINER				
TUGBANG, ANTHONY D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3729				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Advisory Action

The After Final response (filed on September 4, 2009) has been fully considered, entered, and made of record.

The applicant(s) arguments regarding Claims 14 through 16, filed in this After Final response have been fully considered, but have not been deemed to be found as persuasive.

The applicant(s) make a number of arguments against the prior art, all of which the examiner completely disagrees with.

First, the applicant(s) assert that the prior art does not teach a “hollow bobbin of elongated shape and of flexible material” (lines 3-4 of Claim 14).

The structure relied upon for these limitations are in Fukunaga. Fukunaga shows a hollow bobbin having two tubes (housing halves 4, 5) of electrically insulating material (e.g. plastics, col. 2, lines 46-50) where each half/tube has an interior hollow cross-section that is rectangular shaped in order to support a core of ribbon that is clearly located inside this rectangular shaped interior hollow section of each half/tube (as shown in Fig. 6). One definition of a “tube” can mean a *slender channel*¹, which would most certainly not limit this structure to being one that is completely enclosed. So the so called “C-shaped configuration” or “open trough” structure of the housing halves (4, 5) that the applicant(s) allude to would certainly meet the definition of a “tube” (i.e. slender channel).

With respect to the term of “flexible”, the hollow bobbin of Fukunaga again, is made of an electrical insulating material (e.g. plastics). It is notoriously well known that electrically insulating materials can be formed to be pliable, flexible, with the ability to bend, particularly

¹ Webster's Online Dictionary - <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tube>

within art recognized equivalent devices of transformers. This is self evident and obvious from Wermine. The casing 15 of Wermine being an outer casing is insignificant to the extent that Wermine solves the very same problems of art recognized equivalent transformers, utilizing electrically insulating material to support a core or coil, and that electrically insulating materials are known to be “flexible” for the advantages taught by Wermine. So the teachings of Wermine are completely applicable to the structure of Fukunaga.

Second, the applicant(s) assert that the prior art does not teach a “coil arranged around a periphery of said bobbin” (line 6 of Claim 14). Let us look at the term of “periphery”. This can certainly mean *an external boundary*². One side, or any side, of the bobbin (e.g. 4, 5) is indeed an external boundary. Therefore, the fact that the coil is arranged along one side of the bobbin, would meet the limitations of the “coil arranged around a periphery of said bobbin”.

Third and lastly, the applicant(s) assert that the prior art does not teach a “core formed by ribbon wound inside the hollow bobbin” (lines 7 of Claim 14). This feature was relied upon in Fukunaga. In Fukunaga, the amorphous sheets that make up the core are equivalent to ribbon. These sheets are laminated to form a winding in a C-shaped configuration, as part of the operation of the transformer. Since this C-shaped winding is inside the rectangular shaped interior hollow cross section of the bobbin, this would certainly meet the limitations of the “core being formed by a ribbon wound inside the hollow bobbin”.

All in all, the applicant(s) are reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference (i.e. Wermine) may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference (i.e. Fukunaga); nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly

² Webster's Online Dictionary - <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/periphery>

Art Unit: 3729

suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Accordingly, the rejections regarding the combination of Fukunaga and Wermine, are maintained.